

From: Great Horned Owl
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/24/02 12:25pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

I am neither a law school student nor an attorney. However, as a member of the public invited to comment on the Revised Proposed Final Judgment, I must object.

As a private citizen who has followed the Federal Government's complaint against Microsoft, I have long believed Microsoft to be a monopoly. In my opinion, Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson's Memorandum and Order, dated June 7, 2000, was correct, and His Honor's Final Judgment, also dated June 7, 2000, was correct and appropriate.

Furthermore, I object to and believe to be entirely inappropriate the Revised Proposed Final Judgment. As I read the Judgment, it includes no provisions for the altering of the corporate structure of Microsoft Corporation, most certainly not on the scale of those provisions in Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson's Final Judgment.

In closing, I most strenuously object to the language in Section III, Paragraph J. In my opinion, this paragraph's explicit language of non-restraint against Microsoft Corporation severely limits the punitive effect of this Revised Proposed Final Judgment, giving it the effect of a verbal reprimand or slap on the wrist, when what is called for is a far more severe penalty.

Respectfully,

Brian Donnelly
Bedford, NH